DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 941 PS 009 187

AUTHOR Welsh, James B.
TITLE Follow Through Pupil Achievement Characteristics in Philadelphia, 1974-1975. Vol. I: Cross-Sectional Data. Report No. 7664.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 75
GRANT OEG-0-8-522481-4649
NOTE 96p.; For related document, see PS 009 188

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Achievement Rating; Achievement Tests; *Comparative Analysis; Comparative Testing; *Cross Sectional Studies; *Early Childhood Education; *Program Evaluation; Standardized Tests
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This report is a cross-sectional analysis of the 1974-1975 mid-year performance of Follow Through, Non-Follow Through and District groupings of pupils in the Philadelphia School District. The report is divided into four parts: Part I offers comparisons of each Follow Through grouping with all other groupings in terms of mean score differences, percentages scoring below the national sixteenth percentile, and percentages scoring at or above the national fiftieth percentile; Part II is a brief inter-model comparison in terms of rankings on mean standard scores; Part III compares Spring 1974 and Spring 1975 test performance on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (Kindergarten) and on the California Achievement Test (Grade 1-3); Part IV provides test data for the fourth-grade pupils enrolled in Follow Through schools. Results indicate that the positive program effects observed in grades K and 1 in 1973-1974 have been extended to grade 2 in 1974-1975 for the total program aggregate, and that during the program years (K-3) the Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented models continue to exhibit superior performance among the models, followed closely by the Bank Street and EDC models. The Appendix volume of basic data tables accompanying this report is available upon request from the Office of Research and Evaluation, The School District of Philadelphia. (Author/JMB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136941

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOLLOW THROUGH
PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT CHARACTERISTICS
IN PHILADELPHIA
1974-1975
VOL. I: CROSS-SECTIONAL DATA
DECEMBER, 1975

Report Prepared by:

James S. Welsh
of the
Follow Through Evaluation Staff

Report Number 7664
Grant Number OEC-0-8-522481-4649

Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Program

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood
Evaluation

Constance Clayton
Acting Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Office of Research and Evaluation

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

PS 009187

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. August Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Philip Davidoff, Esq.

Mr. George Hutt

Robert M. Sebastian, Edq.

Mrs. Felice Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools
Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Robert L. Poindexter, Executive
Deputy Superintendent

David A. Horowitz
Associate Superintendent
School Services

Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

FOLLOW THROUGH DISTRICT LIASION ASSISTANTS

District 1	Herbert Rogers
District 2	Gerri Walker
District 3	Floyda Marcus
District 4	Shirley McGill
District 5	Flossie Allen
District 6	Marie Tervalon

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Very Great Thanks are due:

The Major Administrative Officers of the Follow Through Program in the School District of Philadelphia for their recommendations regarding the final form of this report.

The Systems Development, Data Management and Production (SDDMP) section of the Division of Instructional Research and Development Services (DIRDS), and the Division of Testing Services (DOTS) for providing city-wide testing tapes.

Mr. Charles West of the Division of Data Processing for generating the necessary data files and Mrs. Linda Burns for developing the data analyses programs.

Mrs. Sara Myers, and Mrs. Mildred Marcus for typing this report.

The School District of Philadelphia
Follow Through Schools and Principals

1974-75

Schools	Principals
Arthur School 20th and Catharine Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19146	Mr. Murray Ginsburg
Duckrey School 15th and Diamond Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19121	Mr. Sylvester Webb
Dunbar School 12th St. N. of Columbia Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mrs. Rubye L. McLauglin
Drew School 38th St. S. of Powelton Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19104	Mrs. Franzella Buchanan
Elverson School 13th and Susquehanna Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19133	Mr. Albert Norrell
Ferguson School Seventh and Norris Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mrs. Sadie Mitchell
Fulton School Haines St. E. of Germantown Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mr. Jesse DiTeodore
Harrison School 11th and Thompson Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. William C. Williams
J. B. Kelly School Pulaski Avenue and Hansberry Street Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mr. William Seiberlich
Ludlow School Sixth and Master Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. Charles Day

Follow Through Schools	Principals 1974-75
McMichael School 36th St. and Fairmount Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19104	Mr. John A. Watson
Nebinger School Sixth and Carpenter Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19147	Mr. Richard Becker
Pratt-Arnold School 22nd and Susquehanna Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19121	Mr. Elliot Jacoby
E. M. Stanton School 17th and Christian Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19146	Mr. Vernon Jones
Stevens School Spring Garden W. of 13th Street Philadelphia, Penna. 19123	Mr. Morris Berkowitz
Waring School 18th and Green Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19130	Mrs. Felicita Hanna
A. Wilson School 46th and Woodland Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19143	Mr. Stanford James
J. Wister School Wakefield and Bringhurst Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mr. Rosamond S. Lindsey Auxiliary

ABSTRACT

This report is a cross-sectional analysis of 1974-1975 mid-year performance of Follow Through, Non-Follow Through, and District groupings of pupils on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, (SESAT), (Kindergarten) and the California Achievement Test, (CAT), (Grades 1-4). Later reports will present results in a quasi-longitudinal format (including information on preschool experience and length of program exposure) and a quasi-longitudinal-plus-absence format.

The principal findings of the present volume are:

(1) Mean performance for Total Follow Through exceeds that of Total Non-Follow Through on all major test areas in Kindergarten, Grade One, and Grade Two, but on no tests in Grade Three.

(2) Total Follow Through exhibits higher percentile rankings in 1974-1975 than in 1973-1974 at all grade levels, K-3, and gains more than Total Non-Follow Through in grades K-2.

(3) The Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented models generally exceed the performance of their district Non-Follow Through comparison classes at all grade levels (K-3). The Bank Street and EDC models exceed their district Non-Follow Through groupings

at grades K - 2. The Philadelphia Process model exceeds its district Non-Follow Through grouping at two grades, and the remaining two models (Florida Parent and Bilingual) do so at one grade.

(4) Across grades K - 3, the three highest-ranking models are Behavior Analysis, Parent Implemented, and Bank Street, respectively.

(5) Data from fourth-grade pupils in Follow Through schools (which are baseline data obtained prior to program expansion) show the Parent Implemented, Bank Street, and Philadelphia Process models rank first, second, and third, respectively, at that grade.

It is concluded that the positive program effects observed in grades K and 1 in 1973-1974 have been extended to grade 2 in 1974-1975, for the total program aggregate, and that during the program years (K - 3) the Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented models continue to exhibit superior performance among the models, followed closely by the Bank Street and EDC models.

Introduction:

This report is concerned solely with cross-sectional analysis of Spring, 1975 data from the City-Wide Testing Program administered by the Division of Testing, Office of Research and Evaluation, School District of Philadelphia. Tests were admistered to all pupils in the city: the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT) for kindergarten and the California Achievement Test (CAT) for grades one, two, three, and four. A second volume will provide quasi-longitudinal analyses of achievement data, dimensioned by length of program exposure and Head Start or equivalent experience, and a third volume will further dimension achievement by absence intervals. (The local evaluation unit must also provide performance information on attainment of objectives for the Philadelphia Title I Report. The objectives and their degree of attainment for 1974-1975 are included in this volume as an appendix.)

Three major divisions underlie the comparisons undertaken here:

1. Follow Through data, comprising scores from all 208 Follow Through classes, grouped by model, by district, and a Total Follow Through aggregate;

2. Non-Follow Through data, comprising scores from 227 comparison classes in Districts 1-6, grouped by district and a Total Non-Follow Through aggregate. (This comparison group is an exact parallel to the comparison group employed in the National Follow Through Evaluation in 1972-1973 by Stanford Research Institute, with the exception of a very few classes added to equalize the distribution across districts in certain grades.)

3. District Summary data, comprising scores from all pupils in the city, grouped by district (for Districts 1-6), and a Total Districts 1-6 aggregate and a Total City aggregate (Districts 1-8).

A substantial caution should be borne in mind regarding these comparisons. As in previous years' cross-sectional analyses performed by the local evaluation unit, the assumed population of concern is the Philadelphia Follow Through population. Therefore, differences in mean scores are reported in terms of measurement error and not in terms of sampling error, following the procedure outlined by Davis (1964). However, an Appendix of basic data tables is provided as a companion volume. Required figures (N, mean, standard deviation) for the computation of any desired statistical inferences to other populations may be obtained there.

The report is divided into three parts: Part I offers comparisons of each Follow Through grouping with all other groupings (including Follow Through, Non-Follow Through, and District Summaries) in terms of mean score differences, percentages scoring below the national sixteenth percentile, and percentages scoring at or above the national fiftieth percentile; Part II is a brief inter-model comparison in terms of rankings on mean standard scores; Part III focuses on Spring, 1975 test performance by grades in comparison with Spring, 1974 performance on the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (Kindergarten) and on the California Achievement Test (Grades 1-3); Part IV provides test data for the fourth-grade pupils enrolled in Follow Through schools. (Part IV data are essentially base-line data for the fourth-grade expansion of Follow Through, which began shortly after city-wide testing.)

Part I: Comparison of All Groups in Terms of Mean Score Differences and Percentages Scoring at the Extremes of the National Percentile Distribution in Spring, 1975.

Table 1 is presented as an orientation to the model and district groupings within Follow Through. It can be seen that the Philadelphia Process Model, the Florida Parent Model and the EDC Model groupings are synonymous with the District 1, District 3, and District 6 groupings, respectively. In the other three districts, model and district groupings overlap. Thus, District 2 Follow Through comprises schools from the Behavior Analysis, the Bank Street, and the Bilingual models. District 4 Follow Through comprises two Behavior Analysis schools. District 5 comprises schools from the Bank Street, the Bilingual, and the Parent Implemented models (the last model having only one school). Both groupings are important for the comparisons presented in Part I.

The Appendix volume gives basic data tables for the Spring 1975 testing, upon which all the analyses in this report are based. The data include number of pupils, mean score, number and percentage scoring below the national sixteenth percentile, and number and percentage scoring at or above the national fiftieth percentile, for every grouping by subtest area within grade. Mean scores reported for the SESAT are raw scores; mean scores reported for the CAT are the standardized Achievement Development Scale Scores (ADSS).

Table 1 FOLLOW THROUGH SCHOOLS ORGANIZED BY DISTRICT AND MODEL GROUPINGS

District Groupings		Model Groupings
District 1		**Philadelphia Process**
Drew	-	Drew
McMichael	-	McMichael
Wilson	-	Wilson
District 3		**Florida Parent**
Nebinger	-	Nebinger
Stevens	-	Stevens
District 6		**EDC**
Fulton	-	Fulton
Kelly, J.B.	-	Kelly, J.B.
Wister, J.	-	Wister, J.

District 2		**Behavior Analysis**
Arthur	→	Arthur
Stanton, E.M.	→	Duckrey
Waring	→	Pratt-Arnold
District 4		**Bank Street**
Duckrey	→	Dunbar
Pratt-Arnold	→	Elverson
	→	Stanton, E.M.
District 5		**Bilingual**
Dunbar	→	Ferguson
Elverson	→	Ludlow
Ferguson	→	Waring
Harrison		
Ludlow		
		Parent Implemented
	→	Harrison

The Appendix volume also contains the complete comparison matrices of all groups by subtest within grade. The comparison is in terms of the standard error of measurement of the difference between means for two groups, either independent or overlapping, as explained below. Tables 2-12 in this section summarize the information from these Appendix tables, focusing on the Follow Through groupings and adding information about percentages scoring at the extremes of performance (below the sixteenth percentile and above the fiftieth).

Before proceeding to the analyses, it should be explained that the following statements of rationale governed the method of reporting in this part (and are applicable in ways that will be apparent there to Parts II, III, and IV also): (1) Every group is compared with every other group so as not to focus merely on what appear on the surface to be appropriate comparisons, e.g., District 1 Follow Through vs District 1 Non-Follow Through. Exhaustive comparison of each group with every other group is an attempt to offset any single defective comparison base, (2) National pupil percentiles and standard errors of measurement for raw scores (SESAT) and standard scores (i.e., ADSS on CAT) provided by the test manuals are admittedly debatable interpretative indices when used, as was done in this report, with group means. They are used, however, in the case of both the percentiles and standard errors, in the absence of any national group information. (Averaging percentiles for group data, which is the practice of some scoring services,

does not seem to be a legitimate enterprise, given the fundamentally unequal interval nature of this type of scale.) In both instances, moveover, where the basic comparison context is reference to National norm group performance, use of these indices seemed recommended in spite of precise measurement considerations.

Throughout the report, the Follow Through, Non-Follow Through, and District Summary groupings are referred to in the following abbreviated form:

BS = Bank Street Model

BA = Behavior Analysis Model

BI = Bilingual Model

EDC = Education Development Center Model

FP = Florida Parent Model

PI = Parent Implemented Model

PP = Philadelphia Process Model

D2F = District 2 Follow Through Grouping

D4F = District 4 Follow Through Grouping

D5F = District 5 Follow Through Grouping

TFT = Total Follow Through Program (All Models)

D1N = District 1 Non-Follow Through Grouping

D2N = District 2 Non-Follow Through Grouping

D3N = District 3 Non-Follow Through Grouping

D4N = District Four Non-Follow Through Grouping

D5N = District Five Non-Follow Through Grouping

D6N = District 6 Non-Follow Through Grouping

TNF = Total Non-Follow Through Grouping

TD1 = Total District 1

TD2 = Total District 2

TD3 = Total District 3

TD4 = Total District 4

TD5 = Total District 5

TD6 = Total District 6

TD1-6 = Total District 1 through 6

TC = Total City

Subtest designations are abbreviated as follows:

(1) SESAT:

ENV = Environment

MAT = Mathematics

L&S = Letters and Sounds

A-C = Aural Comprehension

TOT = Total

(2) CAT:

VOC = Vocabulary

CHN = Comprehension

T-R = Total Reading

CPU = Computation

C&P = Concepts and Problems

T-M = Total Mathematics

AJD = Auding

MEC = Mechanics

USG = Usage

T-L = Total Language

SPL = Spelling

TOT = Total Battery

Tables 2-12 provide comparisons of the performance of each Follow Through grouping (BS, BA, BI, EDC, FP, PI, PP, D2F, D4F, D5F, and TFT) against all other groupings for selected test areas. In kindergarten, the scores for Environment, Mathematics, Letters and Sounds, and Total Battery were selected. In Grades One, Two, and Three, the scores for Total Reading, Total Mathematics, Total Language, and Total Battery were selected. Three comparisons are reported in each table. When the mean score for the particular Follow Through grouping addressed by the table exceeds the mean score for the grouping indicated in the left-side margin at a probability of less than .05, an "M" is placed in that cell. In computing the probabilities for mean differences, the formulas given by Davis (1964) were used. For independent groups the required difference between means is found by computing:

$$1.96\ (\text{S.E.M.})\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}},$$

where N_1 and N_2 are the numbers of pupils in each group.

For overlapping groups, the required value is found by computing:

$$1.96\ (\text{S.E.M.})\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{sub}} - \frac{1}{N_{tot}}},$$

where N_{sub} is the number of pupils in the subgroup and N_{tot} is the number in the total group: S.E.M. refers to the standard error of measurement found in the test manual.

When the percentage of pupils scoring below the national sixteenth percentile is lower for the Follow Through group addressed in the table than for the group listed in the left side margin, an "L" is entered in the cell. When the percentage of pupils scoring at or above the national fiftieth percentile is greater for the Follow Through group addressed in the table than for the group listed in the left side margin, and "H" is entered in the cell.

Following is a summary by model of the data found in Tables 2-12. For each model or district grouping, results for each grade are presented independently. Within each grade, model performance is compared with the other models, Total Follow Through, appropriate District Non-Follow Through, Total District, Total Districts 1-6, and Total City. For simplicity of exposition, the three measures compared (i.e., the mean score, the percentage below the sixteenth percentile, and the percentage at or above the fiftieth percentile) are referred to as the "criteria"; the test areas compared are referred to as "tests." Thus, the comment that a model exceeded its district on all tests and all criteria in grade one means that an "M," and "L" and an "H" will be found in the appropriate block of the table for all four test areas in grade one.

Total Follow Through (Table 2): In kindergarten, Total Follow Through exceeds TNF on all criteria and all tests. It exceeds the TD 1-6 grouping on only the below 16th criterion for MAT and the at or above 50th criterion in L & S. TFT does not exceed TC in kindergarten.

In first grade, TFT exceeds TNF on all tests and all criteria. It exceeds the TD 1-6 grouping on all tests for the means criterion, on T-M and T-L for the below 16th criterion, and on T-M, T-L, and TOT for the at or above 50th criterion. Mean performance exceeds Total City performance on the T-R, T-M, and TOT tests; on the other two criteria, TFT exceeds TC only on T-M.

Second grade data show TFT performs better than TNF on all tests for the means and the at or above fiftieth criteria, and on T-L for the below 16th criterion. It performs better than TD 1-6 on all tests for the means criterion only, and does not exceed TC on any tests or criteria.

TFT fails to exceed the TNF and TC groupings in third grade, but does exceed the TD 1-6 grouping in T-R on all criteria.

Table 2. Comparison Matrix for Total Follow Through, by Gra

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO			
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
BS												
BA	MLH								MLH			MLH
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
EDC		H			MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH				
FP					MLH		M H	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH
PI	H					H M H	M H	MLH				
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	L	ML		MLH	MLH	ML
D2F	L	L	LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4F	MLH	MLH	H	M H								
D5F	M H			M H		M H		M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TFT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	M H				
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D3N						MLH	L	ML	M H	M H	H	M H
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		H		
D5N			MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D6N		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	MLH
TD1		MLH	H		M	MLH	M	M H		M		
TD2	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH
TD3						L	L			H		
TD4						ML	MLH			MLH		
TD5		ML	LH	L	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH
TD6					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH		
TD1-6		L	H		M	MLH	MLH	M H		MLH		
TC					M	MLH		M				

n Matrix for Total Follow Through, by Grade and Test Areas.

EN	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
					MLH			MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						H	H M	
	MLH		M H	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	H	M H	M H	MLH								
MLH	M	MLH	L	ML		MLH	MLH	ML				
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
M H												
M H		M H		M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	M H								
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	
		MLH	L	ML	M H	M H	H	M H				
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		H				MLH		
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H		
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH				
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	MLH				
	M	MLH	M	M H		M						
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
		L	L			H						
		ML	MLH			MLH				LH		
L	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH		H M H	M H	M H
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH						
	M	MLH	MLH	M H		MLH				MLH		
	M	MLH		M								

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin;

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Bank Street Model (Table 3): In kindergarten, the Bank Street Model generally exceeds all other models except FP and possibly PI. It is superior to TFT on all tests and criteria. BS exceeds the D2N group on all tests and criteria and the D5N group on all but the mean and the at or above 50th criteria on MAT. It is better than the TD2 and TD5 groups on all tests and criteria. It exceeds the TD 1-6 group on all tests for the below 16th criterion, on all but ENV for the at or above 50th criterion, and on the ENV and TOT tests for the means criterion. BS performs better than the Total City on the below 16th and at or above 50th criteria for MAT and on the at or above 50th criterion for L & S.

In first grade, BS performs generally better than all other models, except BA. It exceeds TFT on all tests and criteria except the below 16th percentage on T-L. It exceeds the D2N, D5N, TD2, and TD5 groups on all tests and all criteria. BS performs better than TD 1-6 on all tests and criteria except the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-L. It exceeds the Total City on all tests for the means criterion, and on all but T-R for the other two criteria.

BS performs generally better than BI, FP, and PP in first grade. It exceeds TFT on all criteria in T-M and T-R. It is superior to D2N on all tests and criteria except the below 16th on T-R, and it is superior to the D5N group on all tests and criteria. It exceeds TD2 on all tests for the means criterion and all tests except T-R on the other two criteria. BS exceeds TD5 on all tests for the at or above 50th criterion

Table 3. Comparison Matrix for Bank Street Model, by Grade and Test A

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R T-M
BS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- -
BA	MLH	MLH	M H	M H			LH	L			LH		
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
EDC	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			H		H
FP					MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
PI	MLH	MLH		H	H	M H	MLH	MLH			H		
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	ML	
D2F	ML	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D4F	MLH	MLH	M H	M H			LH				L		
D5F	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H M H
TFT	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH		
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML			
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	LH
D3N		LH	M H			MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	M H	
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H			MLH
D5N	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H
D6N	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	ML	MLH	MLH	
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	
TD1	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML			
TD2	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	H MLH
TD3						LH	MLH	MLH		MLH	H		
TD4	M H	LH	H	M H		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	LH		L
TD5	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H
TD6		LH	LH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH			
TD1-6	ML	LH	LH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH		
TC		LH	H		M	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML			

n Matrix for Bank Street Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

TEN	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M H			LH	L			LH					
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			H			H		
	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
H	H	M H	MLH	MLH			H					
MLH	M		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	ML				
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
M H			LH				L					
M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	M H	MLH	MLH
MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH				L	
MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML						
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		LH M H		
		MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	M H				
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H				MLH		
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		H		
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	ML	MLH	MLH				
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH				
MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML						
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH
		LH	MLH	MLH		MLH	H					
M H		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	LH			L		
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH		H M H		
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH						
MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH					
	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML						

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

-14-

and on all tests except T-R on the other two criteria. It performs better than TD 1-6 on all criteria for the T-M and T-L tests, and better than the Total City on T-M for the means and the below 16th criteria.

In third grade, BS performs generally better than BI and FP. It exceeds TFT only on the percentage below the sixteenth percentile in T-L. It exceeds D2N in T-L on the means and at or above 50th criteria, and in T-M on the below 16th and at or above 50th criteria. It exceeds D5N only on the at or above 50th criterion in T-M. BS performs better than the TD2 group on all tests for the means criterion and on all tests except T-R for the other two criteria. Against TD5, it shows a greater percentage at or above the 50th percentile on T-M and T-L, and a higher mean on T-L. It fails to exceed the TD 1-6 and TC groups on any tests by any criteria.

Behavior Analysis Model (Table 4): The BA model performs better than BI AND PP in kindergarten. It exceeds TFT on all criteria for L & S, on the at or above 50th criterion for MAT, on the below 16th criterion for TOT, and on no criterion for ENV. It exceeds the D2N group on all tests and criteria, and the D4N group on all tests and criteria except the percentage below the 16th percentile in MAT. It performs better than the TD2 group on all tests and criteria, except the two percentile criteria in ENV, and better than TD4 on the at or above 50th criterion in MAT and L&S. It exceeds TD 1-6 by the two percentile criteria for MAT and L&S, but does not exceed TC.

Table 4. Comparison Matrix for Behavior Analysis Model, by Grade and T

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R T-M
BS				L	MLH	M H	M	M H	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH MLH
BA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- -
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
EDC		H	ML	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH MLH
FP					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
PI					MLH	M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D2F		L	LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D4F	H	MLH	M H	MLH									H
D5F	H	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
TFT		H	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L H
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D3N		H	M		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH MLH
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	M H MLH
D5N			MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H MLH
D6N		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD1		MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH MLH
TD2	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
TD3					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH MLH
TD4		H	H		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH MLH
TD5		MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
TD6			LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH MLH
TD1-6		LH	LH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH MLH
TC					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH MLH

on Matrix for Behavior Analysis Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

ARTEN		GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	L	MLH	M H	M	M H	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH			H
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	ML
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
H	MLH										H	L	
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L	H		
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	M H
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	ML	MLH
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L			L
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH		MLH
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH		LH
H		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

In first grade, BA performs generally better than all models. It exceeds TFT, D2N, D4N, TD2, TD4, TD 1-6, and TC on all tests and all criteria.

In second grade, BA performs generally better than all models. It exceeds TFT and D2N on all tests and all criteria. It exceeds D4N on all criteria for T-R and T-M, and on the means and the at or above the 50th criteria for TOT. It performs better than TD2 on all tests and criteria, and better than TD4 on all tests and criteria except the below 16th on T-L. It exceeds the TD 1-6 group on all tests and criteria except the percentage below the 16th percentile in ENV. It exceeds the Total City by all criteria for the T-R, T-M, and TOT tests.

In third grade, BA performs generally better than all models except PI. It exceeds TFT, D2N, TD2, and TD4 on all tests and criteria. It exceeds D4N on all tests and criteria except the below 16th for T-R. It performs better than the TD 1-6 group on all tests and criteria except the percentage below the 16th percentile in T-L. It exceeds the Total City on all criteria for the T-R, T-M, and T-L tests.

Bilingual Model (Table 5): In kindergarten, the Bilingual Model fails to exceed any other model. It does not exceed TFT, TD5, TD 1-6, or TC on any test at any criterion.

In first grade, BI does not perform better than any model. It fails to exceed TFT, TD5, TD1-6, and TC on all tests and all criteria. It exceeds D5N only on the percentage below the 16th percentile for T-L.

In second grade, BI again performs better than no other Follow Through model. It fails to exceed TFT, TD5, TDI-6, and TC on any test at any criterion. BI exceeds D5N on all tests for the means criterion, on all but T-R for the at or above 50th criterion, and on all but T-L for the below 16th criterion.

In third grade, BI again performs better than no other Follow Through model. It fails to exceed TFT, D5N, TD5, TD 1-6 and TC on any tests for any criteria.

Table 5. Comparison Matrix for Bilingual Model, by Grade and Test

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GR
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R
BS													
BA													
BI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EDC													
FP					MLH				M H				
PI													
PP	ML												
D2F													
D4F													
D5F													
TFT													
D1N	M H	M H				M H							
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						H	H	H	
D3N													
D4N	H					LH							
D5N							H		ML	MLH	M H	MLH	
D6N						L							
TNF													
TD1													
TD2													
TD3													
TD4													
TD5													
TD6													
TD1-6													
TC													

Matrix for Bilingual Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

TEN	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MLH				M	H						
		M	H									
MLH						H	H	H				
		LH										
			H		ML	MLH	M	H MLH				
		L										

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Education Development Center Model (Table 6): In kindergarten, EDC performs generally better than BI and PP. It exceeds TFT on ENV and TOT by all criteria, on MAT for the below 16th criterion, and on L & S for the at or above 50th criterion. It performs better than D6N on all tests and criteria except the mean for ENV. EDC is superior to TD6 and TD1-6 for the below 16th criterion in MAT and the at or above 50th criterion for L&S. It also exceeds TD1-6 by the latter criterion for ENV. EDC fails to exceed TC.

In first grade, EDC performs generally better than BI. It does not exceed TFT on any test by any criterion. It does perform better than D6N on all tests by all criteria. EDC exceeds TD6 on MAT for all criteria and on T-L and TOT for the below 16th criterion. It exceeds TD1-6 only for the below 16th criterion on T-M. It fails to exceed TL on any test or criterion.

Second grade EDC results are generally better than BS, BI, FP and PP. It exceeds TFT on all tests and criteria, and D6N on all but the percentage at or above the 50th percentile on T-M. EDC performs better than TD6 in MAT on all criteria and on TOT for the below 16th criterion. It exceeds TD1-6 on all tests and criteria except the mean for T-L and the percentage at or above the 50th percentile for T-R. It exceeds TC for T-M on all criteria and for T-L and TOT on the below 16th criterion.

Table 6. Comparison Matrix for Education Development Center Model, by

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R T-M
BS	H								MLH	M H	L	MLH	MLH ML
BA	MLH	L		H							L		
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
EDC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- -
FP	H				MLH	H		LH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
PI	M H					M			H	H	H	L	
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		L			ML	MLH	MLH	ML	
D2F	L	L	H	L	LH	L	L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D4F	MLH	L	LH	M H							L		
D5F	MLH	L	H	M H					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
TFT	MLH	L	H	MLH					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L			ML	L	L	
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	L		L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D3N		L				L			M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H			M H
D5N	MLH		LH	L	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H
D6N	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	ML	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	
TD1	H	L	H	LH		L				MLH		L	
TD2	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			L		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H MLH
TD3										MLH	L	L	
TD4	H	L	H			L				MLH	LH	L	L
TD5	MLH	L	LH	LH					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H M H
TD6		L	H			MLH	L	L		MLH		L	
TD1-6	H	L	H			L			ML	MLH	LH	MLH	L
TC										MLH	L	L	

Matrix for Education Development Center Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

N'	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
OT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
H					MLH	M H	L L	MLH	MLH	ML	M	MLH
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MLH	H M		LH	MLH H	M H H	MLH H	MLH L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH		L			ML	MLH	MLH	ML				
L	LH	L	L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
H							L					
H					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			L	
LH		MLH	L			ML	L	L				
LH	L	L L		L	MLH M H	MLH MLH	MLH MLH	MLH MLH		MLH	M	
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H				M	H	
L	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			H	
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH				
LH	ML	MLH	ML	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH				
LH		L				MLH		L				
LH			L		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
						MLH	L	L				
		L				MLH	LH	L		L		
LH					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	M H	M H	M H
		MLH	L	L		MLH		L				
		L			ML	MLH	LH	MLH		L		
						MLH	L	L				

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

In third grade, EDC performs generally better than BS, BI, and FP. It exceeds TFT only on the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-L. It fails to exceed D6N, TD6 and TC on any test or criterion. It performs better than TD1-6 only on the percentage below the 16th percentile in T-L.

Florida Parent Model (Table 7): In kindergarten, FP performs generally better than all other models. It exceeds TFT on all tests and citeria except the percentage below the 16th percentile on L & S. It scores better than D3N on all criteria for MAT and on the means and the at or above 50th criterion for L & S and TOT. It exceeds TD3 only on the below 16th criterion in MAT. It scores better than TD 1-6 on all tests by all criteria, except the at or above 50th criterion for ENV and better than TC on all criteria for MAT and TOT and all but the below 16th criterion for L & S.

In first grade, FP performs generally better than BI (and close to EDC). It exceeds TFT, D3N, TD3, TD1-6, and TC on all criteria for T-M and on the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-L. It also exceeds TD3 on the mean for T-L.

Table 7. Comparison Matrix for Florida Parent Model, by Grade and T

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRAD	
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-
BS	H	MLH	M H	MLH		M								
BA	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH										
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML
EDC	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	M						
FP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PI	MLH	MLH	M H	M H		M H								
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L			MLH				
D2F	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	L	L	MLH	L	L	L	L
D4F	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH										
D5F	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH		M H				MLH		L		
TFT	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH		MLH	L			L				
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L			L				
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	ML	M		MLH	MLH	M H		
D3N		MLH	M H	M H		MLH	L			MLH				
D4N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	ML		H				
D5N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	M H	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		
D6N	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	ML		ML		L		
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	M		MLH				
TD1	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L			ML				
TD2	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	ML			MLH		L		L
TD3		L				M H				L				
TD4	M H	MLH	M H	MLH		MLH	L			MLH				
TD5	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	MLH			MLH		L		
TD6		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	M		MLH				
TD1-6	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	L			MLH				
TC		MLH	M H	MLH		MLH	L			L				

n Matrix for Florida Parent Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

TEN	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
MLH		M										
MLH												
MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH
MLH		MLH	MLH	M								
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M H		M H										
MLH		MLH	L			MLH						
MLH		MLH	MLH	L	L	MLH	L	L	L	L		L
MLH												
MLH		M H				MLH		L				
MLH		MLH	L			L						
MLH		MLH	L			L						
MLH		MLH	ML	M		MLH	MLH	M H				
M H		MLH	L			MLH						
MLH		MLH	MLH	ML		H						
MLH		MLH	MLH	M H	L	MLH	MLH	MLH				
MLH		MLH	MLH	ML		ML		L				
MLH		MLH	MLH	M		MLH						
MLH		MLH	L			ML						
MLH		MLH	ML			MLH		L		L		
		M H				L						
MLH		MLH	L			MLH						
MLH		M H	MLH			MLH		L				
MLH		MLH	MLH	M		MLH						
MLH		MLH	L			MLH						
MLH		MLH	L			L						

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Second-grade data show FP scores generally better than BI. It exceeds TFT, D3N, TD3, TD1-6, and TC for the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-M. It also exceeds D3N and TD1-6 on MAT by the other two criteria.

In third grade, FP performs generally better than BI. However, it fails to exceed TFT, D3N, TD3, TD1-6, and TC on any test or criterion.

Parent Implemented Model (Table 8): In kindergarten, PI performs generally better than BI and PP (and close to BA). It exceeds TFT on L & S and TOT for all criteria, on ENV for the below 16th criterion, and on MAT for the at or above 50th criterion. PI performs better than D5N on L & S for all criteria, on ENV for the below 16th criterion and on TOT for the means and the below 16th criteria. It exceeds TD5 on all tests by the below 16th criterion and on all but ENV for the at or above 50th criterion. It scores better than TD 1-6 on MAT, L&S, and TOT for the below 16th comparison, and on MAT and L&S for the at or above 50th comparison. Against TC, it scores better on L&S and TOT for the below 16th criterion and on L&S for the at or above 50th criterion.

In first grade, PI performs generally better than BI and EDC (and close to BA). It exceeds TFT on T-M and T-L for the below 16th criterion. PI performs better than D5N on all tests and criteria except T-M on the mean and the at

Table 8. Comparison Matrix for Parent Implemented Model, by Grade

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRA	
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-
BS			L	L					MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	M
BA	L	LH	LH	LH			L				ML			
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
EDC		H	MLH	L	MLH	L	MLH	M H	ML	ML	M	M H	MLH	M
FP			L	L	MLH	L	LH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
PI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	L	L		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	M
D2F	L		LH	L	MLH	L	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
D4F	LH	H	LH	MLH			L				ML			
D5F	LH	H	MLH	MLH		L	L		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
TFT	L	H	MLH	MLH		L	L		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	L	H		L	ML	ML		L
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	M
D3N		LH	M H	L		L	L		M H	MLH	MLH	M H		M
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH		M H	M	M
D5N	L		MLH	ML	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M
D6N	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH		L
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M
TD1		LH	MLH	LH	M	L	L		ML	MLH	M	M	ML	M
TD2	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	L	LH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
TD3			L	L		L	L		M	MLH	ML	M H	L	M
TD4		LH	LH	L		L	LH		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	M
TD5	L	LH	MLH	LH	MLH	L	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
TD6		LH	LH	L	ML	L	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	M	M	L	M
TD1-6		LH	LH	L	M	L	LH		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	M
TC			LH	L		L	L		ML	MLH	ML	M	L	M

Matrix for Parent Implemented Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

N	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
OT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
L					MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH			L				ML			LH	MLH	L
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	L	MLH	M H	ML	ML	M	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	L	LH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LH	M	L	L		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	ML
L	MLH	L	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH			L				ML			LH	MLH	L
LH		L	L		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH		L	L		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	M	MLH	L	H		L	ML	ML		LH	L	L
LH	MLH	L	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
L		L	L		M H	MLH	MLH	M H		MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH		M H	M	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	ML
LH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH		LH	LH	L
LH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	ML
LH	M	L	L		ML	MLH	M	M	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	ML	L	LH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L		L	L		M	MLH	ML	M H	L	MLH	LH	L
L		L	LH		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
LH	MLH	L	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	ML	L	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	M	M	L	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	M	L	LH		ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
L		L	L		ML	MLH	ML	M	L	MLH	MLH	ML

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

or above 50th criteria. It exceeds TD5 on T-R and T-L for all criteria, and exceeds TD1-6 in T-R for the mean, T-M for the below 16th criterion, and T-L on the two percentile criteria. PI performs better than TC on T-M and T-L for the below 16th criterion.

In second grade, PI performs generally better than all other models except BA. It exceeds TFT and TD1-6 on all tests and criteria except the percentage at or above the 50th percentile on T-R. It exceeds D5N and TD5 on all tests by all criteria. It performs better than TC for all tests on the means criterion, for T-R, T-M, and T-L on the below 16th criterion, and for T-M on the at or above the 50th criterion.

Third grade results again show PI performing generally better than all other models except BA. It exceeds TFT and TD5 on all tests for all criterion. It exceeds D5N on T-M, T-L and TOT for the mean and below 16th criteria, and on T-M and T-L for the at or above 50th criterion. PI performs better than TD1-6 on all tests and criteria except the percentage at or above the 50th percentile on T-R. It exceeds TC in all tests for the below 16th criterion, on T-M, T-L, and TOT on the mean criterion and on T-L and TOT for the at or above 50th criterion.

Philadelphia Process Model (Table 9): In kindergarten PP performs generally better than BI. It fails to exceed

Table 9. Comparison Matrix for Philadelphia Process Model, by Grade

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R T-M
BS					LH				MLH			H	MLH MLH
BA													
BI		LH	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
EDC					MLH	H	M H	M H				H	ML MLH
FP					MLH		M H	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH MLH
PI					LH	M H	M H		H				H
PP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	- -
D2F			L		MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH MLH
D4F													
D5F					LH		H		MLH		LH	MLH	MLH MLH
TFT					LH		H		LH			H	MLH MLH
D1N	M	MLH	M H	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H					
D2N	MLH	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	M H	M H	ML	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	H MLH
D3N					L	L	M H		M H		H	M H	H
D4N					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H			H	H MLH
D5N			L		MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H
D6N		LH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	LH	
TNF		H	L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		H	H	
TD1					MLH	H	M H		H				M H
TD2		L	L		MLH	H	MLH	M	MLH		M H	MLH	MLH MLH
TD3					LH		H		H			H	H
TD4					L		M H		H			H	MLH
TD5			L		MLH		M H	M	MLH		M H	MLH	M H MLH
TD6					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H				MLH
TD1-6					MLH	H	M H		H			H	H MLH
TC					LH		H		H				

on Matrix for Philadelphia Process Model, by Grade and Test Areas.

RTEN		GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
		LH				MLH			H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
												M H	H
H	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	H	M H	M H				H	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH		M H	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		LH	M H	M H		H				H			H
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
												H	
		LH		H		MLH		LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		LH		H		LH			H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
H	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H								
H	MLH	MLH	M H	M H	ML	MLH	M H	MLH	M H	H	MLH	M H	M H
		L	L	M H		M H		H	M H		H	M H	H
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H			H	H	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	MLH	H
H	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	LH			H	
	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		H	H			H	H
		MLH	H	M H		H					M H	H	M H
		MLH	H	MLH	M	MLH		M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		LH		H		H			H	H		H	H
		L		M H		H			H		MLH	M H	M H
		MLH		M H	M	MLH		M H	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H					MLH	M H	H
		MLH	H	M H		H			H	H	MLH	M H	M H
		LH		H		H						H	H

NOTE:

Table entires coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

TFT on any test or criterion. It exceeds DIN on ENV, MAT, and L & S for the means criterion, on T-M and TOT on the below 16th criterion, and on T-M, T-L, and TOT on the at above 50th criterion. It fails to exceed TD 1, TD 1-6, or TC on any tests by any criterion.

In first grade, PP performs generally better than BI, EDC, and PP. It exceeds TFT on T-R for both percentile criteria, and on T-L for the at or above 50th criterion. It exceeds DIN on all tests and criteria except TOT on the below 16th criterion. PP performs better than TD1 and TD1-6 on T-R by all criteria, on T-M by the at or above 50th criterion, and on T-L by both percentile criteria. It exceeds TC on T-R by both percentile criteria and on T-L by the at or above 50th criterion.

In second grade, PP performs generally better than BI and FP. It exceeds TFT on T-R by both percentile criteria and on TOT by the at or above 50th criterion. It does not exceed DIN on any test or criterion, and exceeds TD1 only on the percentage below the 16th percentile for T-R, PP performs better than TD1-6 on T-R and TOT on the at or above 50th criterion and better than TC on T-R, by the same criterion.

In third grade, PP performs generally better than BS, BI, EDC and FP. It exceeds TFT on all tests and criteria, but fails to exceed DIN on any. PP performs better than TDI on T-M, T-L, and TOT by the at or above 50th criterion, and on T-M and TOT on the means criterion. It exceeds TDI-6 on T-M and TOT on the means criterion. It exceeds TDI-6 on all tests by the at or above 50th criterion, on T-M, T-L, and TOT for the mean criterion, and on T-M for the below 16th criterion. It exceeds TC on T-L and TOT by the at or above 50th criterion.

In addition to the model groupings, three district groupings (District Two, District Four, and District Five) which cross models are also examined:

District Two Follow Through (Table 10):

In kindergarten, D2F performs generally better than BA, BI, PP, D4F and D5F. It exceeds TFT on all tests, by the mean criterion, and on ENV, L & S, and TOT by the at or above 50th criterion. It exceeds D2N and TD2 on all tests by all criteria, and TD2 on all but the below 16th comparison on MAT. It scores better than TD 1-6 on ENV, MAT, and TOT by the at or above 50th criterion, and on TOT for the mean criterion. D2F fails to exceed TC on any tests by any criterion.

In first grade, D2F performs generally better than BI. It fails to exceed TFT on any tests for any criteria. It exceeds D2N in T-M for the mean and the at or above 50th criteria, and in TOT for the mean criterion. It performs better than TD2 and TD 1-6 only in T-Mfor the at or above 50th criteria. D2F fails to exceed TC on any test or criterion.

In second grade, D2F performs generally better than BI. It fails to exceed TFT or TC on any test or criterion. It exceeds D2N on T-M, T-L, and TOT for the mean and the at or above 50th criterion, and on T-L for the below 16th criterion D2F exceeds TD2 on T-M and TOT for the mean and the at or above 50th criterion, and exceeds TD 1-6 on T-M for the at or above 50th criterion.

Third grade data show D2F performs generally better than BI and FP. It fails to exceed TFT, D2N, TD 1-6, and TC on any test by any criterion. It exceeds TD2 only on T-M for the at or above 50th criterion.

Table 10. Comparison Matrix for District Two Follow Through, by Grade a

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE TH		
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-
BS	H														
BA	M H	M H		M H											
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML
EDC	H	M H	M	M H		H		M H							
FP	H				MLH			H	M H		M H	M H	H	M H	ML
PI	M H	M		H		M H									
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						MLH					
D2F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D4F	M H	MLH	M	M H											
D5F	M H	M H	M	M H					H	H		H			
TFT	M H	M H	M	M H											
D1N	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH		MLH									
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H		M		M H	MLH	M H			
D3N		H	M						H	H		H			
D4N	MLH	M H	M	M H	M	MLH	M H	MLH		H				H	
D5N	M H		MLH	MLH	M	M H	M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			
D6N	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		L	H				
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH		M H		H		H			
TD1	H	MLH	M	M H		M H									
TD2	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH		H				M H		M H		H	
TD3															
TD4	H	H	M	M H											
TD5	M H	MLH	H	M H			H			H		H			
TD6		H				M H		M							
TD1-6	H	H		M H		H				H					
TC															

ison Matrix for District Two Follow Through, by Grade and Test Areas.

RTEN		GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	M H												
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	M H		H		M H								
		MLH			H	M H		M H	M H	H	M H	MLH	M H
	H		M H										
H	MLH						MLH						
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	M H												
	M H					H	H		H				
	M H												
H	MLH		MLH										
H	MLH		M H		M		M H	MLH	M H				
						H	H		H				
	M H	M	MLH	M H	MLH		H				H		
H	MLH	M	M H	M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH				
H	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	MLH		L	H					
H	MLH	M	MLH		M H		H		H				
	M H		M H										
H	MLH		H				M H		M H		H		
	M H												
H	M H			H			H		H				
			M H		M								
	M H		H				H						

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

District Four Follow Through (Table 11):

In kindergarten, D4F performs generally better than BI and PP. It exceeds TFT only in terms of the percentage below the 16th percentile on L & S and TOT. It exceeds D4N on all tests and criteria except the below 16th criterion for MAT. D4F performs better than TD 1-6 only on the below 16th comparison in L&S and TOT. It fails to exceed TD4 or TC on any test by any criterion.

In first grade D4F performs generally better than all models. It exceeds TFT, D4N, TD4, TD 1-6, and TC on all tests and all criteria.

In second grade, D4F performs generally better than all models. It exceeds TFT on all tests by all criteria. It exceeds D4N on T-R and T-M for all criteria, on TOT for the mean and the at or above 50th criteria. It performs better than TD4 and TD 1-6 on all tests and criteria except for the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-L. It exceeds TC on all tests but the below 16th and the mean criteria on T-L.

In third grade, D4F performs generally better than all models, except P I. It exceeds TFT, TD4, and TD 1-6 on all tests by all criteria. D4F exceeds D4N on all tests and all criteria, except the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-R. It performs better than TC on all three criteria for T-R, T-M, and TOT, and on the mean criterion for T-L.

Table 11. Comparison Matrix for District Four Follow Through, by Gra

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE	
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M
BS					MLH	MLH	M	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
BA					M H	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH	ML
BI	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
EDC		H	L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
FP					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
PI					MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D2F			LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
D5F	H		L		MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TFT			L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	L	H
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D3N					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	M H	MLH
D5N			MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH
D6N		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	
TNF	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD1		H	LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH
TD2	M	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD3					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD4					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD5		L	LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD6			L		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH
TD1-6			L	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
TC					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH

on Matrix for District Four Follow Through, by Grade and Test Areas.

RTEN	GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	MLH	MLH	M	M H	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH	ML	M	M H
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	NLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH			H
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	L	H		
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	M H
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		M H	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	ML	MLH
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L			L
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

District Five Follow Through (Table 12):

In kindergarten D5F performs generally better than BI and PP. It exceeds TFT on ENV and [illegible] for the below 16th criterion, and on MAT and L&S for the at or above 50th criterion. It exceeds D6N on all tests and criteria except the mean and the at or above 50th criteria for ENV. D5F performs better than TD 5 on MAT and L&S by both percentile criteria and on TOT by the below 16th criterion. It exceeds TD 1-6 on only the below 16th comparison for MAT and TOT and on the at or above 50th comparison for L&S. It fails to exceed TC on any test, by any criterion.

In first grade, D5F performs generally better than BI, EDC, FP, and PI (and close to PP). It exceeds TFT on T-M, T-L, and TOT for the below 16th criteria and on T-L for the at or above 50th criterion. It performs better than D5N on all tests and criteria. It exceeds TD5 on all criteria for T-R, T-L and TOT. D5F performs better than TD 1-6 on all tests for the mean criterion, on all but T-R for below 16th criterion, and on T-M and T-L for the at or above 50th criterion.

In second grade, D5F performs generally better than BI and FP. It does not exceed TFT, TD 1-6, or TC on any test or criterion. D5F exceeds D5N on all tests and criteria. It exceeds TD5 on T-M and T-L for the mean criterion.

In third grade, D5F performs generally better than BI and FP. It exceeds TD5 only on T-M and T-L for the at or above 50th criterion. It fails to exceed TFT, D5N, TD 1-6 or TC on any test at any criterion.

Table 12. Comparison Matrix for District Five Follow Through, by G

	KINDERGARTEN				GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRA	
	ENV	MAT	L&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T
BS									L				M	
BA	L						L							
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M
EDC		H		L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						
FP					MLH	L	LH	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH	M
PI					H	M H	H	MLH						
PP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	ML	L	ML		MLH				
D2F	L	L	LH	L	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	ML	ML	MLH	L	MLH	M
D4F	L	LH	H	H			L							
D5F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TFT	L	H	H	L		L	LH	L						
D1N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH						
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	M H		
D3N						ML	LH	L	H	M H				
D4N	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						
D5N			LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		
D6N	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	ML	MLH	L		
TNF	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML				
TD1		LH	H	L	M	MLH	LH	ML						
TD2	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	M H	ML		M
TD3						L	LH	L						
TD4		H				L	LH	L						
TD5		LH	LH	L	MLH		MLH	MLH		M	M			
TD6					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						
TD1-6		L	H	L	M	MLH	MLH	ML						
TC					M	L	LH	L						

ison Matrix for District Five Follow Through, by Grade and Test Areas.

ARTEN		GRADE ONE				GRADE TWO				GRADE THREE			
&S	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
				L		L				M			
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH								
		MLH	L	LH	MLH	MLH		MLH	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		H	M H	H	MLH								
LH	MLH	M	ML	L	ML		MLH						
LH	L	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	ML	ML	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
H	H			L									
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H	L		L	LH	L								
LH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH								
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	MLH	MLH	M H		L	H	
			ML	LH	L	H	M H						
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH						H		
LH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH				
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	ML	MLH	L				
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		ML						
H	L	M	MLH	LH	ML								
LH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	M	H ML		MLH	M	H M
			L	LH	L								
			L	LH	L						L		
LH	L	MLH		MLH	MLH		M	M			H	H	
		MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH								
H	L	M	MLH	MLH	ML								
		M	L	LH	L								

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows;

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Part II: Model Rankings in Terms of Mean Scores, K-3

In this section all seven Follow Through models are ranked in terms of mean raw scores on the SESAT (K) and mean scores on the CAT (1-3). The procedure employed for ties is to average the ranks; thus two schools tied for second are each given a rank of 2½. Tables 13-17 present the data for this section.

In kindergarten (Table 13) the Florida Parent model ranks first overall, and either first or tied for first on all subtests. BS ranks second overall, and ties for first on A-C. P I ranks third overall, and ties for first on A-C. EDC, BA, PP, and BI complete the kindergarten rankings.

In first-grade results (Table 14), BA ranks first overall and first on all test areas, BS ranks second overall, and FP ranks third. PP, PI, EDC, and BI complete the first-grade rankings.

Second-grade results (Table 15) place BA first in six test areas (VOC, CHN, T-R, CPU, T-M, TOT) and first overall. PI ranks first in five test areas (C&P, MEC,USG,T-L,SPL) and second overall. EDC ranks third, with BS, PP, FP and BI completing the second-grade rankings.

Third-grade data (Table 16) show PI ranks first in six test areas (CHN, CPU, MEC, USG, T-C, TOT) and first overall. BA ranks first on five test areas (VOC, T-R, C&P, T-M, SPL) and second overall. PP ranks third, with EDC, BS, FP and BI completing

Table 13. Model Rankings for Mean Kindergarten SESAT Raw Scores, by
and Summary Ranking for Grade.

	ENV		MAT		L&S		A-C		TOT		TOTA GRAD	
	RS	R	RS	R	RS	R	RS	R	RS	R	SUM	R
BS	30	2½	20	3	18	2	19	2	87	2	11½	2
BA	28	5	20	3	17	4	18	4½	84	4½	21	5
BI	27	6	16	7	15	7	17	6½	75	7	33½	7
EDC	30	2½	19	5	17	4	18	4½	84	4½	20½	4
FP	31	1	21	1	20	1	19	2	91	1	0	1
PI	29	4	20	3	17	4	19	2	86	3	16	3
PP	26	7	17	6	16	6	17	6½	77	6	31½	6

Rankings for Mean Kindergarten SESAT Raw Scores, by Test Areas

mmary Ranking for Grade.

	MAT		L&S		A-C		TOT		TOTAL GRADE	
R	RS	R	RS	R	RS	R	RS	R	SUM	R
2½	20	3	18	2	19	2	87	2	11½	2
5	20	3	17	4	18	4½	84	4½	21	5
6	16	7	15	7	17	6½	75	7	33½	7
2½	19	5	17	4	18	4½	84	4½	20½	4
1	21	1	20	1	19	2	91	1	6	1
4	20	3	17	4	19	2	86	3	16	3
7	17	6	16	6	17	6½	77	6	31½	6

Table 14. Model Rankings for Mean First-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Te
Areas, and Summary Ranking for Grade.

	VOC		CHN		T-R		CPU		C&P		T-M	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	291	4	315	2	280	2	248	3	290	2	248	3
BA	308	1	327	1	297	1	260	1	298	1	259	1
BI	277	6	293	5	261	7	242	6	271	6	237	7
EDC	284	5	302	4	270	5½	247	4	270	7	242	5
FP	274	7	290	6½	258	3	254	2	286	3	252	2
PI	292	3	312	3	278	4	240	7	283	4	240	6
PP	293	2	290	6½	275	5½	246	5	279	5	243	4

	AUD		MEC		USG		T-L		SPL		TOT	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	252	3	301	2	295	2	279	2	277	2	239	2
BA	261	1	304	1	310	1	287	1	292	1	253	1
BI	236	7	265	7	257	7	238	7	243	7	217	7
EDC	251	4	275	6	283	5	258	6	262	5	228	6
FP	249	5	284	5	286	3	264	4½	265	4	230	5
PI	244	6	291	3	276	6	264	4½	268	3	231	3½
PP	254	2	290	4	284	4	269	3	257	6	231	3½

Rankings for Mean First-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Test and Summary Ranking for Grade.

R	CHN ADSS	R	T-R ADSS	R	CPU ADSS	R	C&P ADSS	R	T-M ADSS	R
4	315	2	280	2	248	3	290	2	248	3
1	327	1	297	1	260	1	298	1	259	1
6	293	5	261	7	242	6	271	6	237	7
5	302	4	270	5½	247	4	270	7	242	5
7	290	6½	258	3	254	2	286	3	252	2
3	312	3	278	4	240	7	283	4	240	6
2	290	6½	275	5½	246	5	279	5	243	4

R	MEC ADSS	R	USG ADSS	R	T-L ADSS	R	SPL ADSS	R	TOT ADSS	R	TOTAL GRADE SUM	R
3	301	2	295	2	279	2	277	2	239	2	29	2
1	304	1	310	1	287	1	292	1	253	1	12	1
7	265	7	257	7	238	7	243	7	217	7	79	7
4	275	6	283	5	258	6	262	5	228	6	62½	6
5	284	5	286	3	264	4½	265	4	230	5	50	3
6	291	3	276	6	264	4½	268	3	231	3½	53	5
2	290	4	284	4	269	3	257	6	231	3½	50½	4

Table 15. Model Rankings for Mean Second-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Tes
Areas, and Summary Ranking for Grade.

	VOC		CHN		T-R		CPU		C&P		T-M	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	324	5	329	4	310	5	276	4	333	3	283	4
BA	350	1	364	1	342	1	284	1	336	2	290	1
BI	312	6	320	6	299	6	266	5	299	7	264	7
EDC	330	4	344	2	321	3	279	2½	331	4	285	3
FP	309	7	310	7	295	7	279	2½	318	5	279	5
PI	334	2	334	3	327	2	277	3	338	1	288	2
PP	333	3	323	5	319	4	265	6	316	6	269	6

	AUD		MEC		USG		T-L		SPL		TOT	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	272	1	336	3	331	4	319	3	305	5	273	4
BA	266	2½	337	2	343	2	322	2	329	2	290	1
BI	252	7	293	7	294	7	274	7	284	6	254	7
EDC	265	4	330	4	341	3	317	4	315	4	278	3
FP	264	5	305	6	306	6	289	6	282	7	261	6
PI	266	2½	344	1	350	1	331	1	334	1	287	2
PP	263	6	318	5	327	5	305	5	316	3	270	5

odel Rankings for Mean Second-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Test
reas, and Summary Ranking for Grade.

VOC		CHN		T-R		CPU		C&P		T-M	
ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
324	5	329	4	310	5	276	4	333	3	283	4
350	1	364	1	342	1	284	1	336	2	290	1
312	6	320	6	299	6	266	5	299	7	264	7
330	4	344	2	321	3	279	2½	331	4	285	3
309	7	310	7	295	7	279	2½	318	5	279	5
334	2	334	3	327	2	277	3	338	1	288	2
323	3	323	5	319	4	265	6	316	6	269	6

AUD		MEC		USG		T-L		SPL		TOT		TOTAL GRADE	
ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	SUM	R
272	1	336	3	331	4	319	3	305	5	273	4	45	4
266	2½	337	2	343	2	322	2	329	2	290	1	18½	1
252	7	293	7	294	7	274	7	284	6	254	7	78	7
265	4	330	4	341	3	317	4	315	4	278	3	40½	3
264	5	305	6	306	6	289	6	282	7	261	6	69½	6
266	2½	344	1	350	1	331	1	334	1	287	2	21½	2
263	6	318	5	327	5	305	5	316	3	270	5	59	5

Table 16. Model Rankings for Mean Third-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Test Areas, and Summary Ranking for Grade.

	VOC		CHN		T-R		CPU		C&P		T-M	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	333	5	358	5	329	5	307	5	333	5	304	5
BA	363	1	382	2	359	1	325	2	352	1	324	1
BI	320	7	332	7	309	7	288	7	313	7	284	7
EDC	343	4	361	4	336	4	308	4	336	4	306	4
FP	324	6	345	6	319	6	295	6	326	6	294	6
PI	345	3	386	1	354	2	326	1	350	2	323	2
PP	346	2	367	3	341	3	310	3	344	3	310	3

	MEC		USG		T-L		SPL		TOT		TOTAL GRADE	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	SUM	R
BS	356	4	353	5	338	5	339	4	298	5	53	5
BA	367	3	378	3	354	3	372	1	322	2	20	2
BI	320	7	343	6	309	7	298	7	272	7	76	7
EDC	353	5	364	4	340	4	332	5	302	4	46	4
FP	333	6	335	7	316	6	317	6	282	6	67	6
PI	379	1	395	1	366	1	371	2	323	1	17	1
PP	368	2	380	2	356	2	367	3	314	3	29	3

the second-grade rankings.

Across the grades, rankings were computed on two bases (Table 17). By adding all the ranks for each test area across all grades, the models rank (in order) BA, PI, BS, EDC, PP, FP, and BI. (It should be noted that EDC and PP are virtually tied). That procedure, however, lessens the impact of kindergarten performance, since there are fewer test areas on the SESAT than on the CAT. Adding the grade ranks offsets this discrepancy. By that alternate procedure, the model rankings are BA, PI, BS, FP, EDC, PP and BI. The superior kindergarten performance of FP is reflected in this second ranking.

Table 17. Sum of Model Rankings Across Grades K - 3: by Sum of Test Rankings and by Sum of Grade Rankings.

	SUM OF TEST RANKS	RANK
BS	138½	3
BA	69½	1
BI	286½	7
EDC	169½	4
FP	192½	6
PI	107½	2
PP	170	5

	SUM OF GRADE RANKS	RANK
BS	13	3
BA	9	1
BI	28	7
EDC	17	5
FP	16	4
PI	11	2
PP	18	6

Part III: Comparison of 1975 Midyear Performance with 1974 End-of-Year Performance on the SESAT and CAT, in Terms of National Percentile Rank of Mean Scores

In this section, the 1975 midyear achievement test performance of the Follow Through models is compared with their performance in the 1974 testing, which was conducted at end-of-year. This rough comparison is conducted in terms of the national percentile rank of the mean raw scores for the SESAT and the mean ADSS scores for the CAT. Two cautions are introduced before the presentation of data:

1) These comparisons are conducted on the same grade but different pupils, consequently there is little controlling potential over the many possible sources of test score variation.

2) Since the city-wide testing program was switched from an end-of-year schedule to a mid-year schedule beginning in the 1974-1975 academic year, the comparisons conducted here involve different norms: 1974 scores are normed with end-of-year tables and 1975 scores with mid-year tables. Some discrepancy is probably introduced by this. However, given the two different bases involved in the comparison, national percentile ranks provide the only means of roughly equating the testing conducted at the two different time periods.

It is possible, therefore, that certain observed "gains" and "losses" may be an artifact of the switch in norms and/or the switch in pupils across the two years. However, if we assume any artifactual gains or losses to be equally operative

across the various groups of interest (a fairly safe assumption without any controverting data), we may then assess the relative gains or losses of one group vis-a-vis others. Specifically we may examine the gains or losses of a particular model against the general context of gain or loss of Total Follow Through and Total Non-Follow Through.

(It should be noted that the kindergarten test data for the Parent Implemented model, which comprises one school, were lost during processing in 1974. Consequently, no comparison is possible for PI in kindergarten.)

In kindergarten (Table 18), TFT and TNF both register considerable gains across the two time points, with TFT gaining slightly more than TNF. TFT gains are fairly consistent across the different test areas. Among the models, all showed considerable gains except BI, which registered slight gains (and PI, for which data are unavailable.) For most models, the gains were fairly consistent across test areas.

Table 18. Comparison of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 [illegible]

Percentile Rank of Mean SESAT Raw Score, by Test A[illegible]

	ENV			MAT			L&S			A-C			TOT	
	73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	7
	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	7
BS	30	44	+14	44	64	+20	62	80	+18	42	58	+16	44	6
BA	26	34	+ 8	44	58	+14	62	80	+18	34	50	+16	44	5
BI	26	26	0	38	44	+ 6	54	62	+ 8	42	42	0	38	4
EDC	23	44	+11	26	58	+32	48	77	+29	42	50	+ 8	34	5
FP	36	50	+14	50	76	+26	62	86	+24	50	58	+ 8	50	7
PI	--	40	---	--	58	---	--	80	---	--	58	---	--	6
PP	20	23	+ 3	26	50	+24	42	68	+26	22	42	+20	26	4
D2F	36	44	+ 8	50	64	+14	62	80	+18	42	58	+16	50	6
D4F	26	34	+ 8	44	58	+14	68	77	+ 9	34	42	+ 8	44	5
D5F	23	34	+11	38	58	+20	54	77	+23	42	50	+ 8	36	5
TFT	26	40	+14	38	58	+20	58	77	+19	34	50	+16	38	5
TNF	23	34	+11	32	52	+20	54	72	+18	34	42	+ 8	34	4

n of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Performance in Kindergarten:

e Rank of Mean SESAT Raw Score, by Test Areas.

AT		L&S			A-C			TOT		
73 74 75	dif	73 74 75		dif	73 74 75		dif	73 74 75		dif
64	+20	62	80	+18	42	58	+16	44	64	+20
58	+14	62	80	+18	34	50	+16	44	58	+14
44	+ 6	54	62	+ 8	42	42	0	38	40	+ 2
58	+32	48	77	+29	42	50	+ 8	34	58	+ 4
76	+26	62	86	+24	50	58	+ 8	50	72	+22
58	---	--	80	---	--	58	---	--	62	---
50	+24	42	68	+26	22	42	+20	26	44	+18
64	+14	62	80	+18	42	58	+16	50	64	+14
58	+14	68	77	+ 9	34	42	+ 8	44	55	+12
58	+20	54	77	+23	42	50	+ 8	36	56	+20
58	+20	58	77	+19	34	50	+16	38	56	+18
52	+20	54	72	+18	34	42	+ 8	34	48	+14

In first grade results (Table 19), TFT seems somewhat higher than last year and TNF drops one percentile point from last year's score. The strongest gains (both in absolute terms and relative to TNF) were registered in the language areas and spelling. Among the models, BS, BA, and FP recorded substantial gains overall: BA gained more in language and reading than in mathematics, FP gained more in language and mathematics than reading, and the BS gains were fairly equally distributed across reading, mathematics, and language test areas. It is also noteworthy that PI, which lost a percentile point overall, showed a substantial drop in mathematics and substantial gains in language.

TFT in second grade (Table 20) shows substantial gains overall. TNF gained somewhat over last year but considerably less than TFT. For the total battery scores (and obviously, for most subtest areas) all Follow Through models registered sizeable gains over last year's pupil percentile ranks. The most noteworthy differences between the models involve the particular test areas in which the strongest gains occured. For BA and BI the strongest area was reading; for FP it was mathematics; for PI it was language. For BS and mathematics gained more than reading, and for PP reading and language gained more than mathematics. In EDC reading, mathematics and language seemed to gain about the same amount.

In third grade (Table 21) TFT gains somewhat over last year, but TNF gains substantially over last year. Among the

Table 19. Comparison of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 P

Percentile Rank of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Are

	VOC			CHN			T-R			CPU			C&
	73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73
	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74
BS	44	56	+ 8	60	80	+20	49	64	+15	33	53	+20	59
BA	63	74	+11	68	89	+21	66	79	+13	67	72	+ 5	67
BI	37	43	+ 6	60	63	+ 3	43	46	+ 3	37	42	+ 5	55
EDC	44	50	+ 6	60	72	+12	49	54	+ 5	48	53	+ 5	63
FP	35	40	+ 5	38	63	+25	35	42	+ 7	44	63	+19	55
PI	58	59	+ 1	60	80	+20	59	64	+ 5	61	41	-20	70
PP	58	59	+ 1	68	63	- 5	63	59	- 4	44	49	+ 5	63
D2F	42	50	+ 8	60	63	+ 3	46	54	+ 8	48	49	+ 1	63
D4F	68	77	+ 9	68	89	+21	68	81	+13	67	73	+ 6	63
D5F	48	54	+ 6	60	86	+26	51	62	+11	41	49	+ 8	63
TFT	50	56	+ 6	60	72	+12	54	62	+ 8	48	54	+ 6	63
TNF	50	50	0	50	63	+13	49	51	+ 2	44	46	+ 2	55

	AUD			MEC			USG			T-L			SP
	73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73
	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74
BS	61	55	- 6	58	76	+18	37	46	+ 9	50	64	+14	50
BA	49	66	+17	47	79	+32	37	54	+17	43	69	+26	61
BI	37	31	- 6	37	43	+ 6	26	28	+ 2	29	34	+ 5	27
EDC	61	55	- 6	51	54	+ 3	37	40	+ 3	48	49	+ 1	50
FP	61	55	- 6	47	63	+16	31	40	+ 9	40	54	+14	39
PI	49	43	- 6	51	66	+15	26	34	+ 8	40	54	+14	50
PP	49	55	+ 6	65	66	+ 1	37	40	+ 3	56	57	+ 1	61
D2F	37	43	+ 6	42	58	+16	37	34	- 3	38	49	+11	39
D4F	49	66	+17	54	76	+22	37	54	+17	45	71	+26	61
D5F	61	55	- 6	47	70	+23	31	40	+ 9	43	54	+11	50
TFT	49	55	+ 6	51	66	+15	37	40	+ 3	45	57	+12	50
TNF	49	55	+ 6	54	54	0	37	34	- 3	45	46	+ 1	50

of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Performance in First Grade: Rank of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Areas.

CHN			T-R			CPU			C&P			T-M		
73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif
60	80	+20	49	64	+15	33	53	+20	59	71	+12	45	60	+15
68	89	+21	66	79	+13	67	72	+ 5	67	77	+10	67	74	+ 7
60	63	+ 3	43	46	+ 3	37	42	+ 5	55	51	- 4	44	44	0
60	72	+12	49	54	+ 5	48	53	+ 5	63	51	-12	55	52	- 3
68	63	+25	35	42	+ 7	44	63	+19	55	67	+12	50	66	+16
60	80	+20	59	64	+ 5	61	41	-20	70	63	- 7	67	49	-18
68	63	- 5	63	59	- 4	44	49	+ 5	63	59	- 4	52	53	+ 1
60	63	+ 3	46	54	+ 8	48	49	+ 1	63	59	- 4	55	53	- 2
68	89	+21	68	81	+13	67	73	+ 6	63	77	+14	65	76	+11
60	86	+26	51	62	+11	41	49	+ 8	63	67	+ 4	51	57	+ 6
60	72	+12	54	62	+ 8	48	54	+ 6	63	63	0	55	59	+ 4
60	63	+13	49	51	+ 2	44	46	+ 2	55	55	0	50	47	- 3

MEC			USG			T-L			SPL			TOT		
73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif
68	76	+18	37	46	+ 9	50	64	+14	50	64	+14	46	63	+17
67	79	+32	37	54	+17	43	69	+26	61	81	+20	60	78	+18
67	43	+ 6	26	28	+ 2	29	34	+ 5	27	37	+10	34	37	+ 3
61	54	+ 3	37	40	+ 3	48	49	+ 1	50	51	+ 1	53	50	- 3
67	63	+16	31	40	+ 9	40	54	+14	39	64	+25	37	53	+16
61	66	+15	26	34	+ 8	40	54	+14	50	64	+14	55	54	- 1
65	66	+ 1	37	40	+ 3	56	57	+ 1	61	51	-10	60	54	- 6
62	58	+16	37	34	- 3	38	49	+11	39	51	+12	44	53	+ 9
64	76	+22	37	54	+17	45	71	+26	61	81	+20	61	79	+18
67	70	+23	31	40	+ 9	43	54	+11	50	64	+14	46	56	+10
61	66	+15	37	40	+ 3	45	57	+12	50	64	+14	52	59	+ 7
64	54	0	37	34	- 3	45	46	+ 1	50	51	+ 1	49	48	- 1

Table 20. Comparison of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Perf

Percentile Rabk of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Areas.

	VOC			CHN			T-R			CPU			C&P		
	73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	d
BS	36	48	+12	34	47	+13	33	46	+13	33	51	+18	41	66	+
BA	47	70	+23	53	70	+17	47	72	+25	42	65	+23	54	72	+
BI	19	38	+19	39	42	+ 3	23	39	+16	23	36	+13	31	38	+
EDC	33	52	+19	34	57	+23	32	56	+24	33	57	+24	46	66	+
FP	25	34	+ 9	25	35	+10	24	35	+11	33	57	+24	41	53	+
PI	43	57	+14	47	61	+14	45	60	+15	42	51	+ 9	60	72	+
PP	43	55	+12	34	52	+18	41	54	+13	27	35	+ 8	46	53	+
D2F	34	43	+ 9	39	42	+ 3	35	42	+ 7	33	46	+13	46	53	+
D4F	45	73	+28	53	77	+24	46	76	+30	42	65	+23	50	66	+
D5F	30	48	+18	39	47	+ 8	32	48	+16	33	46	+13	41	58	+
TFT	36	52	+16	39	52	+13	35	53	+18	33	51	+18	46	58	+
TNF	45	50	+ 5	39	47	+ 8	43	51	+ 8	29	42	+13	50	53	+

	AUD			MEC			USG			T-L			SPL		
	73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	d
BS	58	63	+ 5	36	58	+22	25	40	+15	33	53	+20	34	41	+
BA	58	63	+ 5	39	61	+22	25	40	+15	35	55	+20	47	61	+
BI	43	36	- 7	19	30	+11	14	19	+ 5	16	23	+ 7	14	28	+
EDC	58	63	+ 5	33	54	+21	32	40	+ 8	35	53	+18	28	48	+
FP	43	49	+ 6	27	38	+11	19	25	+ 6	25	33	+ 8	18	28	+
PI	43	63	+20	39	65	+26	32	50	+18	37	63	+26	53	61	+
PP	43	49	+ 6	36	48	+12	25	32	+ 7	31	43	+12	34	48	+
D2F	43	36	- 7	30	44	+14	19	25	+ 6	27	37	+10	34	41	+
D4F	58	63	+ 5	39	61	+22	25	40	+15	35	58	+23	40	61	+
D5F	43	63	+20	30	48	+18	25	32	+ 7	27	43	+16	28	41	+
TFT	43	49	+ 6	33	51	+18	25	32	+ 7	31	46	+15	34	48	+
TNF	58	63	+ 5	45	48	+ 3	32	32	0	44	46	+ 2	34	41	+

1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Performance in Second Grade:
ok of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Areas.

T-R			CPU			C&P			T-M		
73 74			73 74			73 74			73 74		
dif	74 75	dif	74 75	dif		74 75	dif		74 75	dif	
+13	33 46	+13	33 51	+18		41 66	+25		40 62	+22	
+17	47 72	+25	42 65	+23		54 72	+18		51 69	+18	
+ 3	23 39	+16	23 36	+13		31 38	+ 7		28 36	+ 8	
+23	32 56	+24	33 57	+24		46 66	+20		40 62	+22	
+10	24 35	+11	33 57	+24		41 53	+12		38 57	+19	
+14	45 60	+15	42 51	+ 9		60 72	+12		51 65	+14	
+18	41 54	+13	27 35	+ 8		46 53	+ 7		38 43	+ 5	
+ 3	35 42	+ 7	33 46	+13		46 53	+ 7		40 51	+11	
+24	46 76	+30	42 65	+23		50 66	+16		47 69	+22	
+ 8	32 48	+16	33 46	+13		41 58	+17		38 54	+16	
+13	35 53	+18	33 51	+18		46 58	+12		40 57	+17	
+ 8	43 51	+ 8	29 42	+13		50 53	+ 3		40 49	+ 9	

USG			T-L			SPL			TOT		
73 74			73 74			73 74			73 74		
dif	74 75	dif	74 75	dif		74 75	dif		74 75	dif	
+22	25 40	+15	33 53	+20		34 41	+ 7		32 50	+18	
+22	25 40	+15	35 55	+20		47 61	+14		42 66	+24	
+11	14 19	+ 5	16 23	+ 7		14 28	+14		19 32	+13	
+21	32 40	+ 8	35 53	+18		28 48	+20		31 55	+24	
+11	19 25	+ 6	25 33	+ 8		18 28	+10		24 38	+14	
+26	32 50	+18	37 63	+26		53 61	+ 8		43 63	+20	
+12	25 32	+ 7	31 43	+12		34 48	+14		33 47	+14	
+14	19 25	+ 6	27 37	+10		34 41	+ 7		31 44	+13	
+22	25 40	+15	35 58	+23		40 61	+21		40 69	+29	
+18	25 32	+ 7	27 43	+16		28 41	+13		30 45	+15	
+18	25 32	+ 7	31 46	+15		34 48	+14		32 51	+19	
+ 3	32 32	0	44 46	+ 2		34 41	+ 7		40 47	+ 7	

Table 21. Comparison of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Pe

Percentile Rank of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Area

	VOC			CHN			T-R			CPU			C&P	
	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75
BS	21	26	+ 5	29	33	+ 4	25	28	+ 3	29	41	+12	29	33
BA	36	48	+12	42	47	+ 5	41	49	+ 8	47	62	+15	43	48
BI	18	20	+ 2	19	19	0	16	17	+ 1	21	22	+ 1	20	20
EDC	21	33	+12	24	35	+11	22	33	+11	27	43	+16	29	36
FP	21	22	+ 1	24	25	+ 1	22	22	0	24	27	+ 3	22	29
PI	36	33	- 1	42	50	+ 8	43	45	+ 2	57	62	+ 5	53	44
PP	25	36	+11	26	39	+13	25	37	+12	33	45	+12	29	40
D2F	21	22	+ 1	24	25	+ 1	21	22	+ 1	27	34	+ 7	29	29
D4F	43	48	+ 5	42	50	+ 8	43	53	+10	50	64	+14	43	48
D5F	23	26	+ 3	29	33	+ 4	29	30	+ 1	33	39	+ 6	32	29
TFT	25	31	+ 6	29	35	+ 6	27	33	+ 6	33	43	+10	25	36
TNF	33	48	+15	33	45	+12	35	49	+14	29	50	+21	29	44

	MEC			USG			T-L			SPL			TOT	
	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75	dif	73 74	74 75
BS	31	38	+ 7	17	26	+ 9	25	34	+ 9	25	32	+ 7	24	30
BA	31	46	+15	30	37	+ 7	28	43	+15	37	53	+16	36	48
BI	17	19	+ 2	17	22	+ 5	16	19	+ 3	14	15	+ 1	15	15
EDC	25	38	+13	21	31	+10	21	34	+13	20	26	+ 6	21	33
FP	19	26	+ 7	21	18	- 3	17	22	+ 5	25	22	- 3	19	20
PI	61	54	- 7	36	50	+14	57	51	- 6	37	53	+16	53	49
PP	29	46	+17	21	37	+16	24	45	+21	37	53	+16	28	42
D2F	17	30	+13	17	26	+ 9	16	27	+11	20	26	+ 6	18	24
D4F	33	46	+13	30	37	+ 7	32	43	+11	44	53	+ 9	38	50
D5F	38	36	- 2	21	26	+ 5	32	31	- 1	25	26	+ 1	29	29
TFT	27	38	+11	21	31	+10	24	34	+10	25	32	+ 7	26	34
TNF	31	48	+17	21	43	+22	27	47	+20	30	53	+23	27	47

lson of 1973-1974 Performance and 1974-1975 Performance in Third Grade:
tile Rank of Mean CAT ADSS Score, by Test Areas.

CHN			T-R			CPU			C&P			T-M		
73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif
29	33	+ 4	25	28	+ 3	29	41	+12	29	33	+ 4	29	37	+ 8
42	47	+ 5	41	49	+ 8	47	62	+15	43	48	+ 5	47	56	+ 9
19	19	0	16	17	+ 1	21	22	+ 1	20	20	0	19	19	0
24	35	+11	22	33	+11	27	43	+16	29	36	+ 7	27	38	+11
24	25	+ 1	22	22	0	24	27	+ 3	22	29	+ 7	22	27	+ 5
42	50	+ 8	43	45	+ 2	57	62	+ 5	53	44	- 9	59	56	- 3
26	39	+13	25	37	+12	33	45	+12	29	40	+11	29	42	+13
24	25	+ 1	21	22	+ 1	27	34	+ 7	29	29	0	26	31	+ 5
42	50	+ 8	43	53	+10	50	64	+14	43	48	+ 5	47	57	+10
29	33	+ 4	29	30	+ 1	33	39	+ 6	32	29	- 3	34	34	0
29	35	+ 6	27	33	+ 6	33	43	+10	25	36	+11	31	40	+ 9
33	45	+12	35	49	+14	29	50	+21	29	44	+15	28	47	+19

USG			T-L			SPL			TOT		
73	74		73	74		73	74		73	74	
74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif	74	75	dif
17	26	+ 9	25	34	+ 9	25	32	+ 7	24	30	+ 6
30	37	+ 7	28	43	+15	37	53	+16	36	48	+12
17	22	+ 5	16	19	+ 3	14	15	+ 1	15	15	0
21	31	+10	21	34	+13	20	26	+ 6	21	33	+12
21	18	- 3	17	22	+ 5	25	22	- 3	19	20	+ 1
36	50	+14	57	51	- 6	37	53	+16	53	49	- 4
21	37	+16	24	45	+21	37	53	+16	28	42	+14
17	26	+ 9	16	27	+11	20	26	+ 6	18	24	+ 6
30	37	+ 7	32	43	+11	44	53	+ 9	38	50	+12
21	26	+ 5	32	31	- 1	25	26	+ 1	29	29	0
21	31	+10	24	34	+10	25	32	+ 7	26	34	+ 8
21	43	+22	27	47	+20	30	53	+23	27	47	+20

models PP, BA, EDC and BS gained most and FP gained somewhat over last year. BI and PI stayed about the same as last year. (It should be noted that PI, the only model to lose percentile points on the total math score in third grade, has the highest 1975 percentile rank for that score. Its 1974 performance was so high that outstanding 1975 performance appears as a slight decline.) Model performance is fairly consistent across test areas, in the third-grade data.

Part IV: Fourth-Grade "Baseline" Data

In this section, the performance of fourth-grade pupils in the Follow Through schools will be analyzed in a manner analogous to that employed in Parts I and II for the regular program years, K-3. Most of these fourth-grade pupils have been enrolled in Follow Through classes previously. Their achievement test performance will be analyzed in the second volume (Quasi-longitudinal Analyses), dimensioned by length of program exposure and by preschool experience. This cross-sectional presentation of Spring 1975 test data includes all pupils in the fourth grades of the Follow Through schools, regardless of the program exposure (or lack of it) during the K-3 years. As part of the local expansion of Follow Through, the program was extended into the fourth grades at all of the original 18 schools. These cross-sectional data are included here as "baseline" measures, obtained just prior to the program extension into fourth grade. However, since most of the pupils are "graduates" of the regular program, the data are also interesting for the study of program effects.

Tables 22 & 23 are analogous to Tables 2-12 in Part I. Models will again be compared against relevant Follow Through and Non-Follow Through groupings. However, in Tables 22-a, 22-b, and 22c several models are collapsed onto each table. The same four test areas (T-R, T-M, T-C, and TOT from the California Achievement Test) will be examined on three criteria: the mean score differences in terms of Davis' formula for comparison, the percentage of pupils scoring below the sixteenth percentile, and the percentage of pupils scoring at or above the fiftieth percentile.

Bank Street Model (Table 22a): BS performs generally better than BA, BI, EDC, FP, D2F, D4F, and D5F model groupings. It exceeds TFT, D2N, TD2, and TD5 on all tests for all criteria. It exceeds D5N on all tests except the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-R. BS performs better than TD 1-6 on all tests for the below 16th criterion and on the mean criterion for T-R. It exceeds the Total City only on T-M for the below 16th criterion.

Behavior Analysis Model (Table 22a): BA performs generally better than BI, EDC, FP, D2F. It exceeds TFT on all three criteria for T-R, T-M, and TOT. BA performs better than D2N on all tests and criteria, but only on the two percentile criteria for T-R against D4N. It exceeds TD4 on all tests by the means criterion and on T-L and TOT by the at or above 50th criterion. It fails to exceed TD4, TD 1-6, and TC on any criterion.

Bilingual Model (Table 22a): BI performs generally better than FP. It fails to exceed TFT, D5N, TD5, TD 1-6 or TC on any test by any criterion.

Education Development Center Model (Table 22a): EDC performs generally better than BI, FP, and D2F. It exceeds TFT on all tests by the at or above 50th criterion and on T-6 and TOT by the mean criterion. It fails to exceed D6N, TD6, TD 1-6, on TC on any test by any criterion.

Florida Parent Model (Table 22b): FP does not perform better than any model. It fails to exceed TFT, D3N, TD3, TD 1-6, or TC on any test by any criterion.

Table 22-c. Comparison Matrices for District Two FT, District Fou
and Total Follow Through Fourth-Grade Pupils, by Test

	DISTRICT TWO				DISTRICT FOUR				DISTRICT FIVE				FOLL
	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R
BS					H		H						
BA					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			L		
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
EDC		L		L	MLH	ML	L	MLH	ML	ML	L	L	ML
FP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
PI					L	H							
PP					LH	M H							
D2F	-	-	-	-	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4F					-	-	-	-					
D5F					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	-	-	-	-	H
TFT					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	ML	L	ML	-
D1N						L							
D2N	MLH	MLH	L	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D3N	H	MLH		L	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH
D4N					MLH	L							
D5N					H	H	H	LH					
D6N													
TNF					MLH	MLH							
TD1													
TD2					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	ML		M	
TD3					L								
TD4													
TD5					MLH	MLH	M H	MLH					
TD6													
TD1-6					L								
TC													

ison Matrices for District Two FT, District Four FT, District Five FT, tal Follow Through Fourth-Grade Pupils, by Test Areas.

	DISTRICT FOUR				DISTRICT FIVE				TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	H		H									
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH			L				L	
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	ML	L	MLH	ML	ML	L	L	ML	L	L	L
MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	L	H										
	LH	M H										
-	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH	MLH
	-	-	-	-								
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	-	-	-	-	H	H	H	H
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	ML	L	ML	-	-	-	-
		L										
M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
L	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH
	MLH	L										
	H	H	H	LH								
	MLH	MLH										
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	ML		M		ML	M H	M
	L											
	MLH	MLH	M H	MLH								
	L											

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Table 22-b. Comparison Matrices for Florida Parent, Parent Impleme
Process Fourth-Grade Pupils, by Test Areas.

	FLORIDA PARENT				PARENT IMPLEMENTED				PHILADELPHIA PROCESS			
	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
BS					H	ML	M H	MLH	H		MLH	L
BA					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	L	MLH	MLH
BI	L				MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
EDC					MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH
FP	-	-	-	-	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H
PI					-	-	-	-			L	
PP					LH	MLH	M H	MLH	-	-	-	-
D2F					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4F					H	ML	MLH	MLH		L	MLH	MLH
D5F					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TFT					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D1N						ML	M H	MLH		L		L
D2N					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D3N					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
D4N					MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	L	ML
D5N					H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H		MLH	MLH
D6N							H					
TNF					LH	M	MLH	MLH	LH	L	LH	L
TD1					H	ML	M H	MLH			L	L
TD2					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
TD3					L	ML	MLH	ML	L		L	L
TD4						ML	MLH	MLH			L	L
TD5					MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH
TD6						ML	M H	ML				
TD1-6					LH	ML	MLH	MLH			MLH	L
TC						ML	M H	ML			L	

on Matrices for Florida Parent, Parent Implemented, and Philadelphia Fourth-Grade Pupils, by Test Areas.

	PARENT IMPLEMENTED				PHILADELPHIA PROCESS			
TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	H	ML	M H	MLH	H		MLH	L
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	L	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH
-	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H
	-	-	-	-			L	
	LH	MLH	M H	MLH	-	-	-	-
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	H	ML	MLH	MLH		L	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
		ML	M H	MLH		L		L
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH	MLH	L	L	ML
	H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H		MLH	MLH
			H					
	LH	M	MLH	MLH	LH	L	LH	L
	H	ML	M H	MLH			L	L
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	L	ML	MLH	ML	L		L	L
		ML	MLH	MLH			L	L
	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	ML	MLH	MLH
		ML	M H	ML				
	LH	ML	MLH	MLH			MLH	L
		ML	M H	ML			L	

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"M" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

Parent Implemented Model (Table 22b): PI performs generally better than all other models and district groupings. It exceeds TFT on all tests and all criteria. It exceeds D5N and T-M, T-L, and TD5 for all and on T-R for the at or above 50th criterion. PI performs better than TD5 on all tests and criteria. It exceeds TD 1-6 on all but the mean for T-R and the percentage at or above the 50th percentile for T-M. It exceeds TC on T-M, T-L, and TOT for the mean criterion, on T-M and TOT for the below 16th criterion, and on T-L for the at or above 50th criterion.

Philadelphia Process Model (Table 22b): PP performs generally better than BA, BI, EDC, FP, D2F, D4F and D5F. It exceeds TFT on all tests and criteria. It exceeds D1N on T-M and TOT by the below 16th criterion, and TD1 on T-L and TOT by the same criterion. It exceeds TD 1-6 on T-L by all three criteria and on TOT by the below 16th criterion. It exceeds TC only on T-L for the percentage below the 16th percentile.

District Two Follow Through (Table 22c): D2F performs generally better than BI and FP. It fails to exceed TFT, TD 1-6, or TC on any test by any criterion. It exceeds D2N on T-R, T-L, and TOT for the means criterion, on T-R, T-M, and T-L for the below 16th criterion, and on T-R, T-L, and TOT for the at or above 50th criterion. It exceeds TD2 only on the percentage below the 16th percentile for T-M.

District Four Follow Through (Table 22c): D4F performs generally better than BA, BI, FP, D2F, and D5F (and close to EDC).

Table 22-a. Comparison Matrices for Bank Street, Behavior Analysi
Fourth-Grade Pupils, by Test Areas.

	BANK STREET				BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS				BILINGUAL				
	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R
BS	-	-	-	-									
BA	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	-	-	-	-					
BI	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	-	-	-	-	MLH
EDC	MLH	ML	ML	MLH	MLH	ML	L	ML					-
FP	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	ML	MLH	MLH	LH
PI	L	H											
PP	ML	MLH											
D2F	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH					M H
D4F	ML	ML	ML	MLH									
D5F	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH					H
TFT	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH					H
D1N		ML											
D2N	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH					MLH
D3N	MLH	MLH	L	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH		L			M H
D4N	MLH	ML	L	ML	LH								
D5N	M H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	H							
D6N													
TNF	MLH	MLH	L	L	L	L							
TD1	L	ML	L	L									
TD2	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	M	M H	M H					
TD3	L	L	L	L									
TD4	L	ML	L	L									
TD5	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M	M		M H					
TD6	L	L											
TD1-6	ML	ML	L	L									
TC		L											

rison Matrices for Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, Bilingual, and EDC
h-Grade Pupils, by Test Areas.

		BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS				BILINGUAL				EDC			
L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT	T-R	T-M	T-L	TOT
	-											H	
H	MLH	-	-	-	-						H	M H	H
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	-	-	-	-	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH
	MLH	MLH	ML	L	ML					-	-	-	-
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	M H	ML	MLH	MLH	LH	MLH	MLH	MLH
											H		
											H		
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH					M H	M H	MLH	M H
	MLH												
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	H	MLH					H	H	M H	H
H	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH					H	H	M H	M H
H	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH	MLH					MLH	MLH	MLH	M H
	MLH	MLH	MLH		MLH		L			M H	MLH		M H
	ML	LH											
H	MLH	H	H								H	H	H
	L	L	L								H		
	L												
H	MLH	M	M	M	H M H						M H	M H	M H
	L												
	L												
H	MLH	M	M		M H						H	M H	H
	L												

NOTE:

Table entries coded as follows:

"A" = Mean score of group indicated in table heading is significantly higher than mean score of group indicated at left margin.

"L" = Percentage below national 16th %ile is less than that for group at left.

"H" = Percentage equal to or above national 50th %ile is higher than that for group at left.

It exceeds TFT on all tests by all criteria. It exceeds D4N on T-R for all criteria and on T-M for the below 16th criterion. D4F fails to exceed TD4 and TC on any test by any criterion. It exceeds TD 1-6 only at the percentage below the 16th percentile on T-R.

District Five Follow Through (Table 22c): D5F performs generally better than BI, FP, and D2F. It exceeds TFT on all tests by the below 16th criterion and on T-R, T-M, and TOT by the mean criterion. It fails to exceed D5N, TD5, TD 1-6, or TC on any test by any criterion.

Total Follow Through (Table 22c): TFT fails to exceed TNF, TD 1-6 on TC on any test, by any criterion.

Model rankings for fourth grade are reported in Table 23. It can be seen that PI ranks first overall and first on eight subtests (CPU, C & P, T-M, MEC, USG, T-L, SPL, TOT). BS ranks second overall and first on two subtests (CHN, T-R), PP ranks third overall and first on subtest (VOC). The other models (in order) are BA, EDC, BI, and FP.

Table 23. Model Rankings for Mean Fourth-Grade CAT ADSS Scores, by Test Areas, and Summary Ranking for Grade.

	VOC		CHN		T-R		CPU		C&P		T-M	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R
BS	362	4	399	1	369	1	329	2	356	2	329	2
BA	363	3	388	4	362	4	320	4	350	5	319	4
BI	334	6	347	6	325	6	306	6	321	6	299	6
EDC	359	5	368	5	351	5	311	5	353	4	314	5
FP	330	7	344	7	321	7	287	7	319	7	285	7
PI	366	2	395	2	368	2	331	1	371	1	335	1
PP	368	1	391	3	366	3	321	3	354	3	320	3

	MEC		USG		T-L		SPL		TOT		TOTAL GRADE	
	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	ADSS	R	SUM	R
BS	384	4	390	2	369	3	382	2	332	2	25	2
BA	371	5	378	4	357	5	375	4	323	4	46	4
BI	335	6	353	6	323	6	327	7	292	6	67	6
EDC	385	3	366	5	365	4	358	5	320	5	51	5
FP	325	7	348	7	312	7	333	6	280	7	76	7
PI	415	1	394	1	396	1	388	1	344	1	14	1
PP	393	2	388	3	378	2	380	3	331	3	29	3

Summary and Conclusions:

For the regular Follow Through program (grades K-3), a brief summary of the results from Parts I, II, and III, is offered here. The information included in the summary is (1) performance relative to TFT, District Non-Follow Through, TNF, and TC; (2) rank overall and in each grade; and (3) 1973-1974 percentile ranking compared with that of 1974-1975. (In this summary under number (1), the term "performs better than" refers to only the mean criterion of Part I. Comparisons based on the two percentile criteria, discussed in the text, will not be repeated here).

Total Follow Through: (1) Performs better than TNF on all major test areas (i.e., ENV, MAT, L & S, and TOT for the SESAT and T-R, T-M, T-L, and TOT for the CAT) in grades K, 1, and 2 and better than TC in three tests in grade 1. (2) (Ranks not applicable). (3) Gains more than TNF in K, 1, and 2, but not in 3.

Bank Street Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on all tests in K and 1 and two tests in grade 2; better than D2N on all tests K-2 and one test in grade 3; better than D5N on three tests in K and all tests in grades 1 and 2; better than TNF on all tests in K and 1 and three tests in grade 2; better than TC on all tests in grade 1 and one test in grade 2. (2) Ranks third overall and ranks 2, 2, 4, 5 across grades K-3. (3) Shows very substantial gains between 1973-1974 and 1974-1975 in grades K-2, and consistent (but smaller) gains in grade 3.

Behavior Analysis Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on one test in K, and all tests in grades 1-3; better than D2N on all tests K-3; better than D4N on all tests except T-L in grade 2; better than TNF on all tests K-2 and two tests in grade three; better than T on all tests in grade one and three tests in grades 2 and 3. (2) Ranks first overall and ranks 5, 1, 1, 2 across grades K-3. (3) Shows strong gains between the two time points('73-'74 to '74-'75) in each grade K-3.

Bilingual Model: (1) Performs better than D5N on all tests in grade 2; does not perform better than TFT, TNF, or TC on any test. (2) Ranks seventh overall and seventh in all grades. (3) Shows small gains over '73-'74 in grades K, 1, and 3, and substantial gains in grade 2.

Education Development Center Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on two tests in kindergarten and all tests in grade 2; better than D6N on three tests in K and all tests in grades 1 and 2; better than TNF on all tests K-2; better than TC on one test in grade 2. (2) Ranks fourth or fifth (depending on procedure) overall and ranks 4, 6, 3, 4 across grades K-3. (3) Shows substantial gains in K and 3, very strong gains in grade 2, and mixed results in grade 1.

Florida Parent Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on all tests in K and one test in grade 1; better than D3N on three tests in K and one test in grades 1 and 2; better than TNF on all tests in K, three tests in grade 1, and one test in grade 2;

better than TC on three tests in K and one test in grade 1. (2) Ranks sixth or fourth (depending on procedure) overall and ranks 1, 3, 6, 6 across grades K-3. (3) Shows substantial gains in grades K-2 and small gains in grade 3.

Parent Implemented Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on two tests in K and all tests in grades 2 and 3; better than DIN on two tests in K, three tests in grades 1 and 3, and all tests in grade 2; better than TNF on all tests in grades K and 2, and on three tests in grades 1 and 3; better than TC on all tests in grade 2 and three tests in grade 3. (2) Ranks second overall and 3,5,2, and 1 across grades K-3. (3) Shows mixed results over '73-'74 in grades 1 and 3, and considerable gains in grade 2. (No test data were available for comparison in grade K.)

Philadelphia Process Model: (1) Performs better than TFT on all third-grade tests; better than DIN on three tests in K and all tests in grade 1; better than TNF on all first-grade tests and one second-grade test: (2) Ranks fifth or sixth overall (depending on the procedure), and ranks 6,4,5,3 across grades K-3; (3) Shows strong gains over '73-'74 in grades K,2, and 3, and slight losses in grade 1.

In the 1973-1974 cross-sectional report, it was concluded that the total program produced positive effects in kindergarten and first grade, but not in second and third grades. The 1974-1975

analysis reveals an upward extension of these positive effects to second grade as well. Similarly, last year's report concluded that the differences between Total Follow Through and Total Non-Follow Through on the comparison of 1973-1974 percentile rankings with 1972-1973 percentile rankings were minimal. In this year's report, it is evident that these differences are favorable to Follow Through at three grade levels (K, 1, and 2), where Follow Through "gains" more than Non-Follow Through.

Rankings of the models reveal that particular models perform better at certain grade levels, when compared to other models. Thus, the ranking of the Florida Parent model decreases continually across grades K-3, and the ranking of the Philadelphia Process & Bank Street model increases continually across grades K-3.

Fourth-grade data, obtained just prior to the program expansion into this grade, reveals further shifts of the model rankings. These data will provide initial baselines against which future cross-sectional reporting will examine program effects.

In summary it is concluded that the positive program effects (compared to appropriate Non-Follow Through comparison groups) for the total program aggregate have been extended into second grade in 1974-1975, that two models (Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented) exhibit such positive effects at all program grades, (K-3), and that two other models (Bank Street and EDC) exhibit such effect at two grade levels.

REFERENCE

Davis, F. B. *Educational Measurements and their Interpretation*, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1964

Appendix

Attainment of Achievement Objectives, 1974-1975. (Abstracted from Philadelphia Title I Report 1974-1975)

Objective 1: To improve pupil performance in reading skills.

This objective was fully attained by the project as a whole. The first of two expectations was that on citywide achievement tests in at least three of four grade levels (K-3) the national pupil percentile rank corresponding to the Follow Through pupils' mean score at least one reading subtest would be higher in 1974-1975 than in 1973-1974. This expectation was met not only by the project as a whole, but also by each Follow Through model and by each district's Follow Through group.

The second expectation was that in at least three of the four grade levels the mean score on at least one reading subtest would be significantly higher for Follow Through pupils than for district groups of national-comparison-school (non-Follow-Through) pupils, total districts, and the total of Districts 1-6. This expectation was met by the project as a whole, the Parent Implemented Model separately, and by the Follow Through group in District 4 (which included only Behavior Analysis schools). The Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, and EDC Models approached the expectation by qualifying in two (not three) of the four grade levels.

Objective 2: To improve pupil performance in mathematics skills.

This objective was partially attained by the project as a whole. The first expectation was that on citywide achievement tests in at least three of four grade levels (K-3) the national pupil percentile rank corresponding to the Follow Through pupils' mean score on at least one mathematics subtest would be higher this year than last year. Although kindergarten data for the Parent Implemented Model had been lost during the 1973-1974 scoring, the available data indicated that the expectation of improvement over last year was met by the project as a whole, by each model separately (except Parent Implemented), and by each district's Follow Through group.

The second expectation was that in at least three grade levels the mean score on at least one mathematics subtest would be significantly higher for Follow Through pupils than for district groups of national-comparison-school pupils, total districts, and the total of Districts 1-6. This expectation was met by the Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented Models and by the Follow Through group in District 4. The project as a whole, the EDC and Florida Parent Education Models, and the Follow Through group in District 5 (Bank Street, Bilingual, and Parent Implemented schools) approached the expectation by qualifying in two (not three) of the four grade levels.

Objective 3: To improve pupil performance in language skills.

This objective was partially attained by the project as a whole. The first expectation was that on citywide achievement tests in at least two of three grade levels (1-3) the national pupil percentile rank corresponding to the Follow Through pupils' mean score on at least one language subtest would be higher this year than last year. This expectation was met by the project as a whole, by each model separately, and by each district's Follow Through group.

The second expectation was that in at least two grade levels the mean score on at least one language subtest would be significantly higher for Follow Through pupils than for district groups of national-comparison-school pupils, total districts, and the total of Districts 1-6. This expectation was met by the Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, and Parent Implemented Models and by the Follow Through group in District 4. The project as a whole, the Philadelphia Process Model, and the Follow Through group in District 5 approached the expectation by qualifying in one (not two) of the three grade levels.